



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/037,639	11/09/2001	Peter J. Osbourne	71150-774	6577

7590

08/03/2005

Eric L. Doyle
Dickinson Wright PLLC
Suite 800
1901 L. Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

EXAMINER

SCUDERI, PHILIP S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2153

DATE MAILED: 08/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/037,639

Applicant(s)

OSBOURNE ET AL.

Examiner

Philip S. Scuderi

Art Unit

2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 May 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) ¹⁵⁻²⁸~~1-28~~ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ~~1-14~~ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is in response to Applicant's communication filed May 26, 2005. Claims 1-14 are cancelled. Claims 15 and 17 are amended. Claims 18-28 are new claims.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection has been made. Applicant's amendments have not changed the scope of claim 15. Accordingly, this action is non-final.

Claim Objections

3. Examiner has withdrawn the objections to the claims since Applicant's amendments have overcome the objections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. Examiner has withdrawn the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 since Applicant's amendments have overcome the rejections. However, the following rejections apply to the new claims.

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 18 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 2153

7. Claim 18 recites the limitations “a server for ...” and “at least one client computer system for ...” in lines 2 and 3 respectively. The word “for” renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the following limitations are meant to further limit the claim or merely describe intended use of the claimed invention. Examiner suggests “a server that receives ...” and “at least one client computer system that transmits ...”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

9. Claims 15-18, 20, and 22-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by *SOAP for Platform-Neutral Interoperability* (Kevin Brown, 9/12/2000, hereinafter “Brown”).

10. Regarding claim 15, Brown discloses a method for handling requests using a computer, the steps comprising:

- receiving a request message in a first format [fig. 3 (1)];
- translating the request message from the first format to a second format [fig. 3 (1, 3), the ROPE Proxy translates procedure calls from the Client App (caption of fig. 3 lines 3-5 (last page of the reference))] into XML (i.e. a second format) [p. 10 lines 3-6, SOAP is an XML format];
- wrapping the translated message in a packet [fig. 3 (3)];
- parsing the SOAP packet to determine the operation being called [fig. 3 (4)];

Art Unit: 2153

- calling the operation upon a server [fig. 3 (ROPE Engine), p. 10 lines 22-24];
- creating a SOAP response document from the response from the server [fig. 3 (7)];
- unwrapping the SOAP response document [caption of fig. 3 lines 7-8];
- converting the response from said second format to said first format [caption of fig. 3 lines 7-8];
- and
- transmitting a response message in the first format [fig. 3 (8)].

11. Regarding claim 16, Brown discloses the method applied to claim 15, further including the step of verifying the format of the request message [the ROPE Proxy must parse (implicitly verify) the request in order to convert the request and wrap it in a SOAP packet as shown in fig. 3].

12. Regarding claim 17, Brown discloses the method applied to claim 15, wherein the step of receiving a request message further includes receiving a request message in slash format:

- wherein the step of translating the request message further includes translating the request message from slash format [p. 10 lines 3-6, messages are sent to a URL and URLs comprise slashes] to XML format [p. 10 lines 3-6, SOAP is an XML format];
- wherein the step of converting the response further includes converting the response from XML format to slash format [caption of fig. 3 lines 7-8]; and
- wherein the step of transmitting a response message further includes transmitting a response message in slash format [caption of fig. 3 lines 7-8].

13. Regarding claim 18, Brown discloses a computer system for handling requests, comprising:

- a server for receiving commands and transmitting responses [fig. 3 (ROPE Engine)];

Art Unit: 2153

- at least one client computer system [fig. 3 (Client App)] for transmitting request messages and receiving response messages in a first format [p. 10 lines 3-6, caption of fig. 3];
- a translator [fig. 3 (ROPE Proxy)] which checks the request messages from the client computer system for protocol and format, and translates the request messages into a second format which is a protocol and format which is understood by the server [p. 10 lines 3-6];
- a processor [fig. 3 (IIS)] which receives the translated request messages from the translator in a second format [fig. 3 (3)], transforms the translated request messages into commands that can be understood by the server [fig. 3 (4)], calls information from the server [fig. 3 (arrow pointing from IIS to ROPE Engine)], receives responses from the server [fig. 3 (arrow pointing from ROPE Engine to IIS)], processes the responses from the server into processed response messages in the second format [fig. 3 (7)], and transmits the processed response messages to the translator in the second format [fig. 3 (7)];
- wherein the translator receives the processed response messages from the processor in the second format [fig. 3 (7)], translates the processed response messages into the first format [caption of fig. 3 lines 7-8], and transmits the translated response messages to the client computer system in the first format [fig. 3 (8)].

14. Regarding claim 20, Brown discloses the system applied to claim 18, wherein the first format is a slash format [p. 10 lines 3-6, messages are sent to a URL and URLs comprise slashes].

15. Regarding claim 22, Brown discloses the system applied to claim 18, wherein the second format is via a SOAP packet [fig. 3 (3)].

16. Regarding claim 23, Brown discloses the system applied to claim 22, wherein after the translator translates the request messages, the translator wraps the request messages in SOAP packets and transmits the SOAP packets to the processor [fig. 3 (3)].
17. Regarding claim 24, Brown discloses the system applied to claim 22, wherein the processor wraps response messages in SOAP packets and transmits the SOAP packets to the translator [fig. 3 (7)].
18. Regarding claim 25, Brown discloses the system applied to claim 18, wherein the translator translates request messages from slash format [p. 10 lines 3-6, messages are sent to a URL and URLs comprise slashes] to XML format [p. 10 lines 3-6, SOAP is an XML format].
19. Regarding claim 26, Brown discloses the system applied to claim 18, wherein the translator receives processed response messages from the processor and translates the processed response messages from XML format to slash format [caption of fig. 3 lines 7-8].
20. Regarding claim 27, Brown discloses the system applied to claim 25, wherein after the translator translates the request messages, the translator wraps the request messages in SOAP packets and transmits the SOAP packets to the processor [fig. 3 (3)].
21. Regarding claim 28, Brown discloses the system according to claim 26, wherein the processor wraps processed response messages in SOAP packets and transmits the SOAP packets to the translator [fig. 3 (7)].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

23. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown in view of *Software Magazine – Newsletter* (10/11/2000, hereinafter “Software Magazine”).

24. Regarding claim 19, Brown discloses the system applied to claim 18. Brown does not disclose that the system is a computer reservation system. Nonetheless, providing a computer reservation system that supports SOAP was well known, as evidenced by Software Magazine.

25. In a similar art, Software Magazine teaches a system for providing computerized reservation systems [p. 2 lines 23-25] available over the Internet [p. 2 line 1] that support SOAP [p. 2 line 14]. Given the teachings of Software Magazine, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the SOAP toolkit architecture (Brown fig. 3) to provide computerized reservation services, thereby enabling companies to make their software assets available to business partners via the Internet [Software Magazine p. 1 line 11 – p. 2 line 1].

26. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown.

Art Unit: 2153

27. Regarding claim 21, Brown discloses the system applied to claim 20, wherein the request messages are in slash format [p. 10 lines 3-6, messages are sent to a URL and URLs comprise slashes]. Brown does not expressly teach that the messages sent to URLs are transmitted using sockets. Examiner takes Official Notice that it was well known in the art that requests comprising URLs were often sent via TCP/IP which uses sockets (e.g. HTTP requests). It would have been obvious to send the requests as HTTP requests because this was the most widely used method of requesting a URL.

Conclusion

28. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

29. *Components Online* has been cited in order to establish a date for the Brown reference (*Components Online* p. 6, 9/12/2000) because Brown only discloses that the reference was available in the Fall of 2000 (see the URL), which alone is not specific enough to establish that Brown is prior art.

30. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip S. Scuderi whose telephone number is (571) 272-5865. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8am-5pm.

31. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton B. Burgess can be reached on (703) 305-4792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2153

32. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PSS



Dung C. Dinh
Primary Examiner